

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re CHELSEY M., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B192515  
(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. PJ32449)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHELSEY M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Morton Rochman, Judge. Affirmed.

Debbie M. Page, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_

Chelsey M. appeals from the juvenile court's order continuing her wardship after finding she had committed aggravated assault with great bodily injury. We affirm.

According to the Probation Officer's report, Chelsey M. was first adjudicated and declared a ward of the juvenile court under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 in July 2003 when, at the age of 13 years, she admitted committing misdemeanor battery in violation of Penal Code sections 242 and 243, subdivision (a). The petition was sustained, and Chelsey M. was ordered placed on probation and into suitable placement.

In 2004, the juvenile court sustained a Welfare and Institutions Code section 777 petition and again ordered Chelsey M. into suitable placement. After four unsuccessful group home placements, Chelsey M. was ordered placed at Phoenix House in December 2005 for treatment of her self-acknowledged substance abuse. Chelsey M. repeatedly left Phoenix House without permission. The juvenile court admonished her on January 30, 2006 that such conduct, if it were to continue, would lead to camp community placement.

In February 2006, Chelsey M. again left Phoenix House without permission. She returned and was to be detained at juvenile hall pending further proceedings, but she escaped from the van transporting her to juvenile hall. A bench warrant was issued.

On March 1, 2006, Chelsey M. and two other minors punched and kicked the victim, Guadalupe E. The People filed a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 on April 20, 2006 alleging that Chelsey M. had committed assault by force likely to produce great bodily injury in violation of Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(1). Following an adjudication hearing on June 14, 2006, the juvenile court sustained the petition, determined the offense to be a felony, and calculated the aggregated maximum period of confinement as four years two months.

At the disposition hearing, the defense requested the juvenile court to reconsider its earlier finding Chelsey M. had committed aggravated assault and to find instead she committed the lesser included felony offense of battery with serious bodily injury in violation of Penal section 243, subdivision (d). The court denied the motion on June 22, 2006 and continued the hearing to July 14, 2006 to enable Chelsey M. to be screened for possible placement at the Dorothy Kirby Center.

On July 14, 2006, the court ordered that Chelsey M. remain a ward of the juvenile court, that the previous order for suitable placement remain in full force and effect, and that she be awarded 124 days of predisposition credit. The court also calculated the aggregated maximum period of confinement as four years two months. Because the Dorothy Kirby Center had rejected Chelsey M., the court further ordered that she be screened for possible placement at an alternative facility requested by the defense.

We appointed counsel to represent Chelsey M. on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no issues were raised. On January 31, 2007, we advised Chelsey M. she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Chelsey M.’s attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113.); *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) The order under review is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

WOODS, J.